



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

price, Professor Waehrmund edited for students and amateurs of Persian the comedy in question. The subject is attractive by sound humor, and the modern Persian the play is written in suggests of itself comparisons with the more ancient stock of the language by the peculiar terms and by new formations. In this respect we will only point out how much the number of the prepositions taken from the sphere of the nouns has increased in Neo-Persian, a fact which also may be traced in written modern German, especially in the official and law style. Very interesting is the list of about 36 new formations and significations of words which are still missing in the dictionaries. The book, therefore, may be well recommended to every friend of Persian literature, and connoisseurs as well as the less expert will read it with pleasure and advantage. We hope that the editor may soon be able to publish companion editions of other plays.

JENA, December 7, 1890.

EUGEN WILHELM.

T. Macci Plauti Rudens, edited, with critical and explanatory notes, by EDWARD A. SONNENSCHN, M. A. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1891.

This is a good edition of a good play, in every way suited for use with advanced classes. The introduction discusses the relation of the play to the Vidularia, which had a similar subject, explains sufficiently the peculiar stage-setting of the Rudens, and gives a brief account of the MSS. Information in regard to the action of the play (especially important because there are so few commentaries on the Rudens) is given by a table of entrances and exits, and by summaries in the notes, a better arrangement of the material than that in Brix and Lorenz.

In the text the headings of scenes are given as in the Bembine MS of Terence—a slight but praiseworthy innovation in editions of Plautus. Another innovation is the disregard of Spengel's division into acts; it is not an important matter, but the five-fold grouping of *cantica* and *diuerbia*, though it is not precisely a division into acts, deserves mention either in the text or in the introduction.

The text is sound and trustworthy, the best we have of the Rudens. It contains about 50 conjectures by O. Seyffert and some 20 by the editor; of the latter I should think 191, 321, 579, 766 sure; 253 also is good, but in 1152 the sense seems to demand *te* rather than *tuom*, and *faxere*, 376, is not found, I believe, in Pl. The method of the editor in emendation is thoroughly sound, and is in strong contrast to some attempts to restore the text of Pl. by introducing rare words.

The notes are largely upon the language, and meet fairly well the end which the editor had in mind, to "serve the purpose of a general introduction to the peculiarities of Plautine idiom" (Pref. ix). Errors or slips are extremely rare. Periphrastic forms occur also in direct questions (1419, cf. on 467); *nam* is not properly "interrogative" (687), but only associated with interrogative words; "*quod* = *quoad*" (287) might be misunderstood, and the statement in regard to *en* (p. 189, n.) seems to overlook *en unquam*. The excursus on interjections contains nothing that is not in Richter, Studemund's Studien, I 2, but the notes on conditions, on sequence of tenses, on the fut. indic., and on the subjunctive are real contributions to the syntax of Plautus. As a whole, the

commentary shows how much better work is done by an editor who is thoroughly familiar with his author than by one who takes up a play merely to edit it.

I venture to make two criticisms or suggestions: First, there are too many short notes like (243) "*cedo*, 'give me' (origin uncertain)"; (245) "*ut*, exclamatory"; (264) "*ire*, 'come,'" and 513, 548-553, etc. Second, notes like those on 138 and 611, on 342, 358, 207, 510, which consist of three or four references to parallel passages, are, even when the list of passages is fairly complete, rather materials for notes than actual notes. But I am aware that an editor has not unlimited space at his command.

E. P. MORRIS.

A Finnish Grammar, by C. N. E. ELIOT. Oxford, 1890.

Finnish and Hungarian are the two most important members of the Ugrian branch of the extensive Ural-Altaic family of languages. A Finnish grammar in English really marks a new epoch in the study of this important philological domain, as investigations have hitherto been confined almost exclusively to Russian, Swedish and Hungarian scholars.

The study of the Altaic group is especially interesting in view of its supposed connection with the non-Semitic language of the cuneiform inscriptions, the so-called Sumero-Akkadian. Various distinguished scholars have endeavored to establish an affinity; Lenormant, for example, fancied that he saw a resemblance between Sumero-Akkadian and the Ugro-Finnic family, even going so far as to draw a comparison between the great Finnish epic, *Kalevala*, and the Sumerian mythology; but this hypothesis was ably refuted by Dr. Donner in his Appendix to Haupt's "*Akkadische Sprache*," 1881. Hommel's attempt to identify Akkadian as a branch of the Turco-Tartaric group is, in spite of his confident tone, lacking in sober judgment. The immense difference in point of time between Akkadian and the modern Altaic languages must necessarily increase the difficulty of an accurate comparison, especially as we cannot know what changes the Altaic idioms may have undergone during that period.

Mr. Eliot certainly deserves the credit of having opened up an unexplored field to English-speaking philologists, as his work is, as far as I know, the only grammar of Finnish in our language.

In his introduction, pp. ix-xlvi, he gives a treatise on the language in general, taking up in order its chief peculiarities, such as vowel harmony, vocalic differentiation, etc., concluding with a few pages on the relation of Finnish to the cognate dialects, Turkish, Magyar and the Siberian idioms.

Mr. Bain, in his review of this work in the Academy, January 10th, 1891, quite rightly takes exception to the author's philology, in seeing resemblances between the Finnish and Latin declensions, and in considering that the language presents no great differences from the Aryan family. While it is undoubtedly wrong to consider Finnish as anything but a well-marked agglutinative type, still it is interesting to note that there exists in these dialects a decided tendency to true inflection, so much so as to obscure in certain endings the distinctive differences between inflection and agglutination. In other words, Finnish and Magyar have advanced considerably from the primitive monosyllabic type, but have by no means reached the inflectional stage.